



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,689	12/09/1999	MICHAEL S. PASIEKA	PHA23871	6774

24737 7590 04/09/2004

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/456,689

Applicant(s)

PASIEKA, MICHAEL S.

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to request for reconsideration filed on February 17, 2004 (Paper No. 8). Original application contained Claims 1-17. Applicant did not amend any claims. Remarks filed on February 17, 2004 (Paper No. 8) have been entered and made of record. Therefore, pending Claims 1 – 17 are presented for further consideration and examination.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed February 17, 2004 (Paper No. 8) have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-10 and 12 - 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Muftic (US Patent 5,745,574).

Regarding Claim 1, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to the information, the method comprising the steps of:

maintaining, for a given entity controlling access to the information, a contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity (Column 5 lines 51 – 61); and

utilizing the contact list in conjunction with a revocation list associated with the given entity to determine which of at least a subset of the one or more other entities are authorized to communicate with the given entity (Column 6 lines 29 – 38 and Column 7 lines 4 – 20).

Regarding Claim 16, Muftic teaches and describes an apparatus for controlling access to the information, the apparatus comprising:

a processor-based device for controlling access to information, wherein the processor-based device is operative to maintain a contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the processor-based device (Column 5 lines 51 – 61), and

to utilize the contact list in conjunction with a revocation list associated with the given entity to determine which of at least a subset of the one or more other entities are authorized to communicate with the processor-based device (Column 6 lines 29 – 38 and Column 7 lines 4 – 20).

Regarding Claim 17, Muftic teaches and describes an article of manufacture comprising a machine-readable storage medium containing one or more software programs for use in controlling access to the information, wherein the programs when executed implement the steps of:

maintaining, for a given entity a controlling access to information, a contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity (Column 5 lines 51 – 61); and

utilizing the contact list in conjunction with a revocation list associated with the given entity to determine which of at least a subset of the one or more other entities are authorized to communicate with the given entity (Column 6 lines 29 – 38 and Column 7 lines 4 – 20).

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: the given entity and at least a subset of the one or more other entities each comprise a consumer electronics device (Column 5 lines 51 – 54 and Column 9 lines 64 – 67).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: the maintaining and utilizing steps are implemented in an access control system associated with the given entity (Column 5 lines 51 – 61, Column 6 lines 1 – 21 and 47 – 64).

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: the contact list comprises a local revocation list stored in the access control system (Column 5 lines 51 – 64 and Column 6 lines 29 – 38).

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information including the step of periodically generating a digital signature for at least a portion of the contact list (Column 6 lines 29 – 65).

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: each of at least a subset of the other entities stores a contact list having entries corresponding to entities which have attempted to communicate with those other entities (Column 5 lines 55 – 61 and Column 7 lines 43 – 53).

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 3. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: the revocation list comprises a local revocation list stored in the access control system (Column 5 lines 51 – 54, Fig.2 #240 and Column 10 lines 19 – 25).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information including the step of updating the contact list after a modification of the revocation list (Column 16 lines 34 – 67 to Column 17 line 22).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information including the step of updating the contact list if a new entity not already included in the contact list attempts to communicate with the given entity (Column 7 lines 21 – 52).

Claim 12 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: the contact list is configured such that the revocation flag of a particular entry may not be cleared once that flag has been set as long as that entry remains in the contact list (Column 16 lines 1 – 33).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information including the step of updating the digital signature each time the contact list is updated (Column 6 lines 47 – 60 and Column 7 lines 21 – 27).

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 6. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: the step of updating the contact list after a modification of the revocation list further includes the steps of:

identifying all of the entities in the contact list that do not have their corresponding revocation flag set (Column 6 lines 65 - Column 7 line 20); and
determining, for each of the entities identified as being on the contact list but not having a set revocation flag, whether that entity is on the modified local revocation list, setting its revocation flag in the contact list (Column 16 lines 7 – 20).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 8. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information, wherein: the step of updating the contact list if a new entity not already included in the contact list if a new entity not already included in the contact list attempts to communicate with the given entity further includes the steps of:

storing in the contact list an entity identifier for the new entity if there is sufficient space available in the contact list (Column 16 lines 41 – 46); and
determining if the new entity is on the revocation list; and if it is, setting the corresponding revocation flag the new entity in the contact list (Column 16 lines 41 – 67 up to Column 17 line 22).

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 9. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information including the step of selecting a particular entry of the contact list for removal from the contact list if there is not sufficient space available in the contact list for the new entity (Column 7 lines 53 – 64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muftic (U.S. Patent 5,745,574 hereinafter "Muftic") in view of De Jesus et al. (U.S. Patent 5,832,206 hereinafter "De Jesus").

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Muftic teaches and describes a method for controlling access to information including the step of selecting a particular entry of the contact list for removal. Muftic does not explicitly describe the selecting step is implemented using a random or pseudo-random selection process. However, De Jesus discloses a method to provide security for a keypad

processor of a transaction terminal wherein the selecting step is implemented using a random selection process (De Jesus Column 8 lines 44 – 56 and Column 10 lines 47 – 56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Muftic and De Jesus, a method for controlling access to information including the step of selecting a particular entry of the contact list for removal as taught by Muftic and the selecting step to be implemented using a random selection process as taught by De Jesus to insure that an electronic eavesdropper will be unable to differentiate the actual selection algorithm. The motivation would be to provide a normalized deletion rather than criteria based thereby minimizing computation time.

Conclusion

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 **or**
faxed to: (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 703-305-8912. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..


Application/Control Number: 09/456,689
Art Unit: 2136

Page 10

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Pramila Parthasarathy
March 29, 2004


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100